

IN THE DRAWING

Please replace Figs. 1-3 with substitute Figs. 1-3.

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 25, 2005. Claims 1-6 and 9 remain pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that Claims 2-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claim. Applicant respectfully refrains from so amending Claims 2-6 at this time because Applicant believes their base claim to be presently allowable.

In response to the objection to Figs. 1-3, Applicant respectfully requests that substitute Figs. 1-3, including the legend "prior art", be entered. Substitute Figs. 1-3 contain no new matter. Two (2) copies of substitute Figs. 1-3 are herewith included.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jaspers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,110; hereinafter "Jaspers"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Jaspers fails to recite or suggest (emphasis added) "providing individual first color informations of all neighboring vertical and horizontal pixels," and "interpolating the missing color value at

N:\UserPublic\WX\Amendments\2005 Amendments\NL010046.amd.doc

the position of the selected pixel using the individual first color informations and the second color information, said interpolating step comprising the step of calculating a median value of the individual first color informations and the second color information."

Rather, Jaspers recites processing by sorting data of G12, G34, and RBC in order of magnitude to perform a smart green measurement (See, e.g., Col. 3, lines 34-62). $G12 = (G1 + G2) / 2$ and $G34 = (G3 + G4) / 2$. Jaspers does not recite or suggest calculating a median value of the individual first color formations and the second color formation (i.e., $\text{smartG} = \text{median}(G1, G2, G3, G4, RBC)$). Rather, using the teachings of Jaspers teaches away from Applicant's invention, at least because Jaspers leads to an artifact in vertical colored edges that Applicant's invention overcomes. Thus, the § 102(e) rejection over Jaspers is traversed at least because Jaspers fails to recite or suggest all the elements of Applicant's Claim 1.

Claim 9 recites a device substantially corresponding to independent Claim 1 and is believed patentable for at least the same reasons.


Claims 2-6 depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, Applicant respectfully believes Claims

2-6 to be independently patentable and request separate consideration of each claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Aaron Waxler,
Reg. 48,027
(914) 333-9608
July 25, 2005